

## REMARKS

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1-3, 6-16, and 19-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 24, and 25 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled by virtue of this amendment. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-16, and 19-25 remain pending in this application.

The Examiner objected to claims 10 and 25 for minor typographical errors. The applicants thank the Examiner for identifying these typographical errors, and the applicants have amended both claims as requested by the Examiner. Thus, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-16, 18, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,414,641 (“Carlson et al.”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In particular, amended claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “an electrically conductive blank comprising a periphery and forming a planar surface; a first connector cut from the conductive blank and extending away from the blank in the first direction and forming a cutout region in and co-planar with the conductive blank,” which is not shown by Carlson et al. Rather, and at most, Carlson et al. discloses connecting power to the antenna at an edge or side of the radiating element and not at a point internal to the radiating element as recited by claim 1. Moreover, the portion of Carlson et al. that the Examiner relies on to disclose a cutout region is at most perpendicular to the conductive blank and not co-planar. The specific feed location and the planar nature of the same is supported by the original disclosure at figures 2-4 and the associated text showing feed contact 11 coupled to first connector 34. For at least this reason, amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from Carlson et al. Moreover, as the disclosure the Examiner refers to in Carson et al. is part of the feed/matching network and not part of the planar surface, one of ordinary skill in the art would not rearrange the feed structure of Carson et al. Amended claims 10, 24, and 25 recite limitation similar to amended claim 1 and, at least by virtue of the similarity, are patentably distinct from Carlson et al. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 11-16, 18, and 20-23 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10, 24, and 25 and, at least by virtue of the dependency are

patentably distinct from Carlson et al. Thus, the applicants respectfully request the removal of the pending rejection and allowance of the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Carlson et al. in view of United States Patent 5,532,707 ("Klinger et al."). Claims 7, 9, and 19 depend from claims 1 and 10 as noted above. Because Klinger et al. does not cure the defect noted in Carlson et al. above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 9, and 19 are patentably distinct from the combination of Carlson et al. and Klinger et al. Withdrawal of the pending rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

No claim related fees are believed to be due with this response. In the event any such fees are due, including fees for extension of time not otherwise provided, please consider this a request for such extension of time and debit Deposit Account 08-2623.

August 23, 2006



---

Brian Kinnear, Reg. No. 43,717  
Attorney for Applicant  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
555 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, Colorado 80201  
Telephone: (303) 295-8170  
Facsimile: (303) 295-8261